



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,820	02/08/2002	Makoto Fujiwara	60188-145	9581

7590

07/19/2004

McDermott, Will & Emery
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

DO, THUAN V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2825

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/067,820

Applicant(s)

FUJIWARA ET AL.

Examiner

Thuan Do

Art Unit

2825

AW

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Response

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**. ☒ This action is non-final.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
 - Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-13 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - ☒ All ☐ Some * ☐ None of:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/418,312.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/08/02.

- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to application dated on 02/08/02. Claims 1-13 are pending in this office action.

Claim objections

Claims 1, 10, the term "...exclusive operation information...";
Claim 8, the term "...top-level hierarchy...";
Claim 12, the terms "...priority-order information..." and "...respective functional unit...",
are unclear to what they mean. Clarification or correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-11 of U. S. Patent No. 6415416 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming

Art Unit: 2825

common subject matter, as follows: Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations recite in claims 1-13 of this application are found in claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6415416.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Jadav et al. Pat. No. 6332197.

Regarding claim 6: Jadav teaches a method comprising:

a) defining exclusive operation information among the blocks (col. 5, lines 34-37);

and

b) generating a signal switching control for the resource shared among the blocks based on the exclusive operation information (col. 12, lines 27-38) .

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

Art Unit: 2825

claim and any intervening claims. The reason for allowance is that the prior art of record fails to teach the combination of dependent claim and all other features of independent claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1-5,8-13 are objected if the definition of terms as questioned in the above section will be provided in the next responses. These claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The reason for allowance is that the prior art of record fails to teach the combination of all features of each independent claim.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan Do whose telephone number is 571-272-1891. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0596.



Thuan Do
Patent examiner
7/13/04